

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 30, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over WO 01/24224 (Boonekamp) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,239,550 (Maeda). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are patentable over Boonekamp and Maeda for at least the following reasons.

Boonekamp shows in FIG 1B a light source or burner 12 surrounded by a lamp vessel or outer bulb 11. As clearly shown in FIG 1B and recited on page 9, lines 29-32, a light-absorbing coating 16 is provided over the outer surface of the outer bulb 11. Further, as recited on page 10, lines 1-2, an interference film 15 is applied over the light-absorbing coating 16.

As correctly noted by the Examiner, Boonekamp does not teach or suggest an interference filter located on or in at least a part of the burner. Maeda is cited in an attempt to remedy this deficiency in Boonekamp.

Maeda is directed to tungsten halogen lamp with an infrared reflecting film 4. As correctly noted by the Examiner, the

infrared reflecting film 4 is located on the Maeda burner 1.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 15, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

an interference filter is arranged in at least a part of the burner.

This feature is nowhere taught or suggested in Boonekamp, Maeda, and combination thereof.

Further, the present invention as recited in independent claim 25, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

a second light-absorbing coating located on an inner surface of the outer bulb.

Instead of a light-absorbing coating located on an inner surface of the outer bulb, Boonekamp teaches an interference film 15 which is applied over the light-absorbing coating 16, where the interference film 15 if located over a light-absorbing coating 16 provided on the outer surface of the outer bulb 11, as clearly shown in FIG 1B. Similarly, the Maeda infrared reflecting film 4 is located on the outer surface the Maeda burner 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 15 and 25 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-14 and 16-24 should also be allowed based at least on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 15.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Dicran Halajian/
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
February 21, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101